

SDMS Document ID
1005911

ADMINISTRATIVE
RECORD

PUBLIC
DOCUMENT

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

PROPOSED CLEANUP PLANT *11/09/04*

ORIGINAL

BOUNTIFUL/WOODS CROSS/5TH SOUTH
PCE PLUME SUPERFUND SITE
OPERABLE UNIT 1

PUBLIC COMMENT MEETING

August 24, 2004

Bountiful City Hall
790 S. 100 E.
Bountiful, Utah

Reporters, Inc. 10 West 100 South, Suite 250 · Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
(801) 746-5080 phone · (801) 746-5083 fax · 1-866-310-DEPO · www.reportersinc.net



1 August 24, 2004

6:05 p.m.

2 --oOo--

3 P R O C E E D I N G S

4 --oOo--

5 MS. LINN: We will be talking about the
6 Bountiful/Woods Cross/Fifth South PCE Plume Superfund
7 site. And we will be going over the proposed plan at
8 least in general and talking about our preferred
9 alternative. We will be hopefully giving you information
10 and explaining things to you. You'll have an opportunity
11 to ask questions, make comments. You know, it's your
12 meeting, and we want to hear what you think about what's
13 going on. So that's what we're here to hear. We have, it
14 looks like, more of us than the public here. But there
15 are several players involved in this site, starting with
16 the Environmental Protection Agency.

17 I'm the Peggy Linn, the community involvement
18 coordinator, so if you have questions, I'm probably the
19 easiest one to get ahold of, and my information is in the
20 proposed plan. The project manager is Mario Robles with
21 EPA; with the Utah Department of Environmental Quality,
22 our project manager is Michael Stork; and then with the
23 Water Quality Division of Utah state is Ed Hickey -- this
24 is a test -- and Scott Everett, and I didn't get your
25 position, but he's also with the Utah Department of

1 Environmental Quality, toxicologist. And then we have
2 Wendy O'Brien with EPA who is our toxicologist. And I
3 think that's all the agency people except for one more
4 who's coming in, and this is Dave Allison with the State
5 of Utah. He's a community involvement specialist or
6 coordinator or whatever they call them in Utah. And so
7 he's probably the easiest one to get ahold of for the
8 State if you have any questions, and then we can direct
9 you where you need to talk to others.

10 I don't see a representative, or maybe I do and
11 I haven't met him yet, but with HatchCo that's our
12 potential responsible party in this, and so he -- so
13 HatchCo is another one of the team members of this whole
14 group. I don't want to skip anything here on my little
15 reminders.

16 We also have a court reporter tonight who is
17 taking down everything I say, every little mistake I make,
18 and this is Heidi Hunter, our court reporter. And we will
19 have a transcript available after she's had time to put it
20 together and get it to us. And if anybody did not receive
21 a copy of the proposed plan or would like an extra copy,
22 we will have some extra copies back there. We have some
23 handouts. We have a handout of the presentation and then
24 some handouts about some of the different -- like the TCE
25 and PCE if you want to learn more about those, and some

1 fact sheets on some of the things that will be discussed
2 later in the program.

3 And if anyone did not sign in, would you please.
4 It helps us update our mailing list and helps us keep
5 track of who -- how many we actually had in attendance.

6 Mario is going to give a short presentation
7 about the proposed plan and the preferred alternative.
8 And after his presentation, then we will turn it over to
9 questions and a comment period. And if you get up to make
10 a comment, ask a question, I ask that you be sure and
11 speak loudly. First of all, state your name, first and
12 last name, and then spell your last name and whoever
13 you're affiliated with, if it's a company, an agency, or
14 if you're a citizen, we, of course, would love to hear we
15 have actual citizens here because that's who we really
16 want to get to.

17 So we will give you time then to comment and ask
18 questions. And we ask that you try to focus your comments
19 and questions on the proposed plan. That's what we're
20 here to discuss tonight is this proposed plan for this
21 operable unit. And so if we can focus on that, that will
22 make the evening go a lot better.

23 And again, let me just say that you need to
24 speak loudly because I'm a stickler about that, and I'll
25 be bugging you if you don't speak loud enough for me to

1 hear from the back of the room.

2 So with that, I will turn it over to Mario, and
3 once again, thank you for coming. A couple of other
4 people snuck in. Are they people I should introduce?

5 MR. ROBLES: I know Ken Napp. He's from the
6 HatchCo Company.

7 MR. RANDALL: I'm Brett Randall also
8 representing HatchCo Company.

9 MR. ROBLES: Thank you very much for coming.

10 For the members of the community, I put up my
11 first slide. I apologize, but I think it will give you a
12 better idea of the plumes that we have at this operable
13 unit. Then I'm going to take you to the plume in HatchCo
14 and that's hopefully the only issue we are going to be
15 discussing because we are going to be here in the future
16 discussing the other plumes.

17 At the Bountiful/Woods Cross Superfund Site, NPL
18 site, we have several plumes. I think that you should be
19 aware that there are severe sources of contamination,
20 there is just not one. The source that we are going to be
21 focusing our discussion is the HatchCo, and that is this
22 little plume over here. These other plumes belong to
23 another remedial investigation that we are doing right
24 now, that remedial investigation should be completed at
25 the beginning of next year, and then we are going to have

1 another public meeting so we can discuss that remedial
2 investigation.

3 But for now, this is the area that EPA has
4 investigated and all of these plumes essentially are
5 flowing together. So they are merging, as you can see, on
6 this little area.

7 We have two plumes. The TCE, which is coming
8 from an up gradient source, and then we have the ^{TCE P}~~PCE~~ 11/09/04
9 known as Trichloroethylene, which is essentially
10 originating at the HatchCo property. You can see the red
11 lines, they stop right here, and there is a reason for
12 that, the plume really continues, and it's a little bit
13 larger than it shows in that figure.

14 See this red box over here, next one, that's
15 what it used to be inside that red box. W.S. HatchCo
16 Company, the HatchCo Service Company, and Jack Kelley, at
17 different times they operated a trucking facility at this
18 site. At the time -- at the peak of the operations, they
19 had about 75 trucks and about 125 employees. They had
20 several potential sources of contamination. They had an
21 underground storage tank, they had oil-water separator,
22 and they also had a wash rack with a French drain that was
23 sort of in between the site.

24 The whole site at the time they were using it
25 included about 13 acres of property. Now the site was

1 divided and essentially is about 3 acres. Through the
2 operations, they transported petroleum products, petroleum
3 solvents, asphalt, oil petroleum. On the records they
4 also transported some fruits and perhaps some food
5 products.

6 They had -- through the years, they had several
7 spills, leaks from those trucks, potentially they had also
8 some discharges to the surface that went into the soils
9 and eventually migrated into the ground water.

10 Essentially this is the entrance to I-15. This
11 is 500 South. This is street over here, which you cannot
12 see, is 700 South, and this one is 800 West.

13 So we completed our remedial investigation. Ken
14 Napp, over here, he collected many, many samples. They
15 installed many monitoring wells to monitor the ground
16 water. The result of the remedial investigation is that
17 we really are not concerned with the soils, with the
18 surface soils, but the central portion of the site is
19 contaminated with solvents, like TCE, vinyl chloride, and
20 other petroleum products. There is Naphthalene, there is
21 diesel fuel, and others, contamination.

22 Out at this facility, we did our risk
23 assessment, actually we did two risk assessments. HatchCo
24 did a risk assessment. EPA did another risk assessment
25 for Operable Unit 2 that we are going to discuss at a

1 later time. The interesting thing is that pretty much
2 both risk assessments came to the same conclusion, that
3 the water should not be used for drinking because it's
4 contaminated, and that the water should not be used for
5 indoor use within the boundaries of the plume.

6 What I mean by "indoor use," I mean if you take
7 a shower, you know, the vapors coming from that, that
8 water may not be good for you. And essentially the area
9 that concerns me would be the area within this boundary
10 where the contamination is the highest, and also the
11 contamination that is coming from the other plume, so it's
12 not just this plume.

13 Ecological concerns, we really don't have any
14 ecological concerns. There is no nice natural habitat.
15 We are not concerned about plants, wildlife, or animals.
16 The site is industrial, tanks and heavy traffic, and it's
17 not conducive to wildlife. And we really did not look
18 into endangered species, whatever my toxicologists are
19 concerned about the endangered species in the area.

20 So out of all of the investigations that we did
21 and the risk assessments we did, we had cleanup
22 objectives. The first objective is to protect human
23 beings from exposure to contaminated ground water, and the
24 other one is to restore ground water to a beneficial use
25 in the future, I mean, long-term beneficial use.

1 So with those clean-up objectives, the team, the
2 EPA, the state, and HatchCo essentially came with these
3 clean-up alternatives.

4 I'm missing Number 5 over here, but there is a
5 reason for, during screening process, that alternative was
6 eliminated really early, didn't make it to the final
7 alternative.

8 We have the no action. The no-action
9 alternative, we have to include it, as a reference point
10 so we can compare it to the other alternatives.

11 All of the other alternatives are described in
12 the proposed plan. And I believe that you have a copy of
13 the proposed plan. You can read about it. Or if you have
14 any specific questions about the other alternatives, I
15 would like to discuss them with you, otherwise we would
16 like to move forward.

17 One important point over here is institutional
18 controls. Normally these alternatives would be
19 protective. We have controls to keep people from drinking
20 this water. So the State and EPA, we are going to start
21 discussing on ways that we can prevent or prohibit the
22 installation of wells in this area. So this is in
23 progress. And by the time we have the decision, we should
24 be able to come into the agreement what institutional
25 controls we should have for this site.

1 So out of all these alternatives, there are two
2 alternatives that we choose, the first one: Monitor
3 natural attenuation; and the second one, enhanced in-situ
4 biological/chemical bioremediation. Those are the ones
5 that EPA and the State feel that are appropriate for this
6 site.

7 This meeting is for you to ask any questions
8 about these alternatives as related to HatchCo to provide
9 comments so that we can incorporate those comments and
10 provide response to those comments when we issue the
11 decision. So if you have any questions, this is the time.

12 MS. LINN: Any comments, any concerns, anything
13 you would like explained a little bit more?

14 MR. FRANK: On the whole presentation or just on
15 that section?

16 MS. LINN: This is the whole presentation.

17 MR. FRANK: On 14S -- well, plume, are there any
18 indications where that's coming from?

19 MR. ROBLES: There is.

20 MS. LINN: Just a minute, can you state your
21 name for us, please, and tell us your affiliation, citizen
22 or whatever.

23 MR. FRANK: My name is George Frank, and I work
24 for Holly Refinery, the Woods Cross Refinery across the
25 street, city corner and whatever.

1 MR. ROBLES: As stated in the proposed plan, and
2 I believe you have a copy of it, the concentrations pretty
3 much start right here at HatchCo. This is where the
4 source of this contamination is, then the concentrations
5 decrease and the --

6 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't hear you.

7 MR. ROBLES: On HatchCo on the property, where
8 the plume starts, the concentrations are significantly
9 high, the background, the concentrations go down. At the
10 location where AW 14S is, they go up again. So one of the
11 conclusions of the remediation investigation, our study,
12 is there is potentially another source there, and I think
13 that -- yes, there is a potential, but we cannot tell for
14 certain if that's the case.

15 And the reason that that's the case is because
16 EPA, through the other operable unit, collected some
17 ground water and some soil samples from a zone on top of
18 the ground water that is no saturated, and out all of
19 those samples, we really didn't get any significant
20 detects.

21 MR. STORCK: There's probably 25, 30 samples
22 that's taken a direct push and there was one hit and at .9
23 micrograms per liter. So it was nothing to show any
24 significant source, at least from what we saw from those
25 samples.

1 MR. ROBLES: So it is possible, you know, but I
2 have to make the decision whether or not I'm going to
3 spend a lot of money trying to figure that source or I'm
4 going to spend money fixing the problem, okay. That's
5 another issue that we need to resolve within the near
6 future.

7 MR. FRANK: That is not to further investigate
8 that at this time?

9 MR. ROBLES: Yes. That is the reason that I
10 recommend a pilot for this. We are going into that.
11 That's one of the reasons. Any other questions?

12 MS. PASCOE: I'm Carma Pascoe and we have
13 property at 1500 West and Fifth South. I guess I really
14 don't understand any of this, but my question concerns
15 this plume we're talking about, you showed up there went
16 as far west as 8th West?

17 MR. ROBLES: Can we go back to -- I guess.

18 CITIZEN: I guess I couldn't -- I want to know
19 how far back that plume is.

20 MR. ROBLES: Let's go back almost to the
21 beginning. That's good. This over here, this is 1100
22 West. This is 1100 West. This one I believe is -- no,
23 this one is 500 South. The plume is largely made of
24 HatchCo. According to the reports, it is possible that we
25 have another source. It continues over here. It goes

1 around this way. We have detected -- on some of these
2 domestic wells, some of these dots, we have detected
3 concentrations of PCE, and we have detected concentrations
4 of TCE.

5 I think that the argument could be made where is
6 that coming from? At this point, essentially we don't
7 care. We care that we have the detected some
8 concentrations of PCE and TCE. I don't know if they are
9 related to this plume or they are related to this plume.

10 MS. PASCOE: Or whether they're getting
11 together?

12 MR. ROBLES: Excuse me?

13 MS. PASCOE: Or whether they're getting together
14 and they're all going together at a certain point.

15 MR. ROBLES: Yes. Eventually they are going to
16 merge, but we don't know where that point would be down
17 this area, because they are just detects.

18 MS. PASCOE: But that plume is still moving west
19 and north and south, correct?

20 MR. ROBLES: If the plume is still moving --

21 MS. PASCOE: Or is it just going to be
22 stationary from now on if nothing is done?

23 MR. ROBLES: The modeling that came up
24 essentially is saying that the plume, the maximal spread
25 it could reach. He has some predictions that he's

1 modeling and that's the case.

2 In my opinion, the modeling studies that we did,
3 we worked with Ken, with HatchCo with some of their
4 modeling, but it's just modeling. What you put in is what
5 you put out. For certain I cannot tell you, but the
6 numbers show that -- according to this report, that is
7 pretty much stable.

8 MS. PASCOE: Thank you.

9 MR. ROBLES: Any other questions?

10 MS. PASCOE: I have another one.

11 MR. ROBLES: Go ahead.

12 MS. PASCOE: Because I'm here to learn. You're
13 talking about two propositions, one you're talking about
14 the natural -- the natural thing, and then we're talking
15 about adding something to the soil.

16 MR. ROBLES: To the ground water.

17 MS. PASCOE: To the ground water. And where do
18 you start treating the ground water? Do you start it at
19 HatchCo? Could you -- where do you start?

20 MR. ROBLES: Well, the plan is to start at
21 HatchCo, Ma'am. The plan is to start at HatchCo. And
22 what we are going to be doing -- depending on the public
23 comment period -- essentially, is injecting food-grade
24 products into the aquifer and this will accelerate the
25 biodegradation, and essentially would turn that into

1 eventually harmless compounds.

2 MS. PASCOE: How long does it take for the
3 additive that you put in to start the cleanup versus the
4 natural cleanup that's now in the process?

5 MR. ROBLES: If we allow the natural cleanups,
6 some of the estimates that we have it's going -- it could
7 be I believe 2027, from 2027 to 2057. I think that's the
8 numbers that we have on the model.

9 MR. NAPP: The modeling shows that natural --
10 essentially, if you don't do anything is allow this to run
11 its course, as Mario said, modeling is modeling, so you
12 have to sort of speculate. And what you do is you input a
13 range of numbers so that you try to capture the most
14 conservative against liberal points, and that range
15 produced the predicted cleanup time between 2020 and 2057
16 is the year, so 18 years to 53 years, something like. My
17 name is Ken Napp, and I work for HDR Engineering. I was
18 retained by HatchCo. And at that point the ground water
19 outside of the HatchCo property is predicted to reach the
20 drinking water standard.

21 MS. PASCOE: 2020 versus 2058?

22 MR. NAPP: Somewhere in that time frame. The
23 most optimistic would be 2020; most pessimistic would be
24 2057.

25 MR. ROBLES: The good thing is my grandson is

1 going to be working then on this project because I will be
2 gone.

3 MR. BANGERTER: My name is a Larry Bangerter.
4 I'm from here in Bountiful.

5 I just have a question. I'm curious if the
6 drought is leaching some of the chemicals into other
7 chemicals causing it to draw itself to each other, mix.
8 Sometimes you get a leaching effect on chemicals where
9 they join, and they'll produce toxins that won't quit and
10 that drought situation could be driving this thing.

11 MR. ROBLES: You know, it is possible, and the
12 reason I don't want to go there is because that is part of
13 the operable units from Number 2, Operable Unit Number 2.
14 What we found on the study is the ground water is going
15 down significantly. That reverses sometimes, especially
16 over there where MW14 is. The latest data that we got is
17 essentially the gradient reverses slightly to the east,
18 but essentially -- we can discuss that later if you want
19 to talk about that specific point.

20 Any other questions?

21 MR. ROBLES: Thank you very much. Ma'am,
22 another question from you?

23 MS. PASCOE: No.

24 MR. ROBLES: Your house is 1500. You're way
25 over there.

1 MS. PASCOE: Just want to know about the plume.
2 I was interested and I came because I wanted to learn a
3 couple of things. You've helped me somewhat, now maybe I
4 can better understand the report that I'm reading.

5 MR. ROBLES: If nobody has any questions, we
6 would like to open up for public comments and that will be
7 my last slide all the way to the last one.

8 MS. LINN: The public comment period is opened
9 on August 7th and will be open until the close of business
10 on September 7, and you can mail in your comments, you can
11 e-mail your comments. If you would like to make your
12 comments tonight and just speak them and be done with it,
13 that's the purpose of the court reporter.

14 And we have Mario's address up there and his
15 e-mail address, and that information is also on the back
16 of the proposed plan.

17 MR. ROBLES: Any questions or comments from
18 anyone? Okay, if there are no comments, I guess we close
19 the meeting.

20 MS. LINN: I appreciate the comments and
21 questions that we've had thank you very much for coming
22 out.

23 (The proceedings concluded at 6:34 p.m.)
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

State of Utah)
) ss.
County of Salt Lake)

This is to certify that the proceedings was taken before me, Heidi Hunter, a Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Utah, residing in Salt Lake City;

That the proceedings was by me reported in stenotype, and thereafter caused to be transcribed into typewriting, and that a full, true, and correct transcription of said testimony so taken and transcribed is set forth in the foregoing pages, numbered from 2 to 16, inclusive.

I further certify that I am not of kin or otherwise associated with any of the parties to said cause of action, and that I am not interested in the event thereof;

WITNESS MY HAND and official seal at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 13th day of September, 2004.

My Commission Expires:

November 5, 2006


Heidi Hunter, RPR

